

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO**

**John Najdl,**

**Case No. 1:24CV00177**

**Plaintiff,**

**JUDGE PAMELA A. BARKER**

**-vs-**

**Magistrate Judge Reuben J. Sheperd**

**Commissioner of Social Security,**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND  
ORDER**

**Defendant.**

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Reuben J. Sheperd (Doc. No. 15), recommending that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. No objections have been filed. For the following reasons, the Report and Recommendation is ADOPTED and the decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED.

**I. Background**

On January 29, 2024, Plaintiff John Najdl filed a Complaint (Doc. No. 1) challenging the final decision of the Defendant Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”), denying his application for disability insurance benefits (“DIB”) under Title II of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) *et seq.* (“Act”). Pursuant to Local Rule 72.2(b), the case was referred to the Magistrate Judge.

On October 30, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, in which he found that (1) the ALJ’s decision that Plaintiff does not meet or equal Listing 12.03(C) is supported by substantial evidence; and (2) the ALJ’s hypothetical question to the Vocational Expert and the resulting Residual Functional Capacity (“RFC”) accurately reflect Plaintiff’s functional limitations.

(Doc. No. 15.) The Magistrate Judge, therefore, recommends that the decision of the Commissioner denying Plaintiff's application for benefits be affirmed. (*Id.*) Objections to the Report and Recommendation were to be filed within 14 days of service, i.e., by no later than November 13, 2024. No objections were filed.

## **II. Standard of Review**

The applicable standard of review of a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation depends upon whether objections were made to that report. When objections are made, the district court reviews the case *de novo*. Specifically, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) states in pertinent part:

The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instruction.

Although the standard of review when no objections are made is not expressly addressed in Rule 72, the Advisory Committee Notes to that Rule provide that "[w]hen no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes. Moreover, in *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985), the United States Supreme Court explained that "[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."

## **III. Analysis and Conclusion**

Here, as stated above, no objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Sheperd that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. This Court has nonetheless carefully and thoroughly reviewed the Report and Recommendation and agrees with the

findings set forth therein. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Sheperd is, therefore, ADOPTED, and the decision of the Commissioner denying Plaintiff's application for disability insurance benefits is AFFIRMED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: November 14, 2024

s/Pamela A. Barker  
PAMELA A. BARKER  
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE